



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

tions" (in the sense in which the term is used) against which Dr. Pidge warns us (p. 41).

The author's treatment of the several prophetic books is fair, though necessarily incomplete. There are a few infelicities, and some of them will no doubt be corrected in a second edition. On p. 26 he claims, for example, "from internal evidence that Joel is the earliest of" the prophets, while on p. 48 this internal evidence is reduced to the matter of Joel's position in the list of minor prophets, and the situation described is there said to harmonize better with a very late date. Dr. Pidge maintains the genuineness of the book of Isaiah, on the ground that Isaiah, in chaps. 40-66, has departed from Jeremiah and others simply in viewing the future as if it were present, through a larger discourse than they do; but the difficulty is not just this, it lies rather in the fact that by the supposition Isaiah's predictions have no reference to his historical situation and to the needs of his contemporaries. He rather transfers himself to a situation which he has not even predicted and prophesies from that point of view to another generation of men. The author himself cautions us against such a theory in other parts of the book. It seems to be easy for writers of all schools to accept a modification of the older view respecting Daniel (pp. 113, 114). As for the present reviewer, he cannot see how one with Professor Sayce's opinion of Daniel can any longer be made to pose as "orthodox" (p. 109), even if he does oppose the conclusions of critical scholars in less important questions.

The issue, by the American Baptist Publication Society, of a book which quotes with approval so much from Driver's *Introduction* is an evidence that we have gone far toward grasping the truth expressed by Dr. Pidge when he says, in substance, that questions of authorship and date are purely critical, not vital (pp. 24, 75).

CHARLES RUFUS BROWN.

---

**Galilaea auf dem Oelberg**, wohin Jesus seine Jünger nach der Auferstehung beschied. Ein Beitrag zur Lösung der vermeintlichen Widersprüche in den evangelischen Berichten von den Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen. Von D. RUDOLPH HOFMANN. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896. Pp. 53. M. 1.

In this interesting pamphlet Professor Hofmann returns to a subject which he handled forty years ago in a programme of the Fürsten-

schule zu Meissen—the interpretation of the word “Galilee” in Matt. 28:16. Now, as in 1856, he maintains that the term in this context refers to a region near Jerusalem much frequented by Galilean pilgrims, namely, the northerly height of the Mount of Olives and its vicinity. This use of the name can, he thinks, be traced back from modern times through the Middle Ages to the second century. The volume of evidence brought forward in support of this position is certainly impressive, but the value of part of it (and the most important part) can be easily shown to be exceedingly precarious. It is proved that mediæval Jerusalem, from the end of the thirteenth century, had a Galilee in its immediate neighborhood, but beyond that there is little except conjecture. Testimonies are few and far between for the next nine hundred years, and those supposed to occur in the literature of still earlier times, that is, of the first four centuries, are either due to misunderstanding or are of doubtful authority. Two of the writers of the fourth century are claimed by Professor Hofmann in support of his theory—Lactantius and Chrysostom; but the passages quoted are anything but conclusive. Special stress is laid on several statements in the Acts of Pilate and on a curious passage in Tertullian’s Apology. The language of the former is certainly unequivocal. A Judean Galilee is clearly implied in the sentence: “We saw Jesus, whom you crucified, in Galilee with his eleven disciples at the Mount of Olives” (xiv of recension B). If this could be proved to date from the second century, it would establish the early application of the name to a spot close to Jerusalem. That early date, however, is far from certain. The “Acts” may represent the fourth century rather than the second. The very existence of Christian Acts of Pilate in early times has not yet been demonstrated, much less the identity of our Pilate literature with early documents. The words of Tertullian: “Cum discipulis autem quibusdam apud Galilæam Judææ regionen ad quadraginta dies egit” (Apol. 21) admit of a quite different construction. “Judæa” here probably means “Palestine” (as in Tacitus, *Hist.*, ii, 79), in which case the province of Galilee is intended. Moreover, the extraordinary statement in the context that Pilate was procurator of *Syria* (Syriam . . . procuranti) makes it inconceivable that Tertullian can have been minutely acquainted with the nomenclature of the country round Jerusalem almost two hundred years before his time. It is, therefore, impossible to resist the conclusion that the external evidence for the theory is gravely defective; and so, as the rest of the argument is insufficient by itself, Professor Hofmann’s clever and plausible reason-

ing cannot be accepted. He may be right, but he has not yet proved his case.

W. TAYLOR SMITH.

EXETER, England.

---

**The Epistle to the Romans; a Commentary Logical and Historical**

By JAMES M. STIFLER, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Crozer Theological Seminary. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1897.

It is remarked by the author in the Preface that this book is "not put forth in the interest of any theological system." But who, we may ask, would suspect that a book which claimed to be a scientific commentary *was* put forth in the interest of any system of theology? It goes without saying that it cannot be a commentary worthy of the name if it is put forth in the interest of any system of theology. To be put forth for that purpose would simply mean falsification of facts. Is there not, at the close of the nineteenth century, enough of the scientific spirit infused into the study of the Bible, so that a commentator need not assure his readers that his interpretation is straightforward, that it is really exposition and not imposition? Alas, if this be not true!

We are also informed in the Preface that the King James version is used as the basis of the commentary "because it is the one still more commonly read, and also because it is less presumptuous to criticise it than the other." But surely Dr. Stifler, as a New Testament teacher, feels that the King James version *ought* not to be more commonly read than the other. The fact that it is more read is a proof of the indifference and ignorance of Christian people. It seems as though teachers of the Bible in particular should take every opportunity to commend the revised version. Not to do so is, practically, to approve the King James version.

The work of Dr. Stifler is, confessedly, not a commentary in the ordinary sense of that term. It is rather a free reproduction and paraphrase of the thought of the epistle. The critical quality of the work may be indicated by the treatment of a single passage of the text, and we will take his discussion of the first passage that is characteristic of the epistle, 1: 3, 4: "Concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead." "Jesus Christ," says the author, "is declared to be pre-